..ESUME

ED 141 196 SO 009 913

AUTHOR Wirt, Frederick M.
TITLE If This Keeps up....Current School Policy Making and Political Learning.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association (Chicago, Illinois, September 2-5, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; Data Analysis; *Educational Policy; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Knowledge Level; Learning; *Political Attitudes; *Political Influences; Political Issues; *Political Socialization; Politics; Prediction; *Student Attitudes; Student Reaction

ABSTRACT

The current political conflict over school policy making is raised as a source of political learning for the young. It is hypothesized that the current politicization of educational issues influences students as never before and that this influence has great potential for re-shaping perceptions and evaluations of the political world. In the last decade a set of constituencies of the school system has challenged authority and decisions long imposed by the education profession. Each constituency focuses on a distinctive policy which it wants altered to accomodate a new distribution on resources and values. Conflicts discussed include desegregation, finance reform, teacher power, accountability, and student rights. Common features of the new school politics include the continual power/resource struggle; centralization of authority in American government; widespread political agitation; financial problems; the political learning context of students; and the perception, judgment, and conceptualization of the political process by the young. Speculation indicates that political conflict in local schools over the last decade has provided a teaching surrogate, the salience of school issues for the young has transcended other kinds of politics, and it should have had greater effect on political learning than traditional classroom instruction. Further research on political learning among the young is needed to turn this information from speculation into data. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141196

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

If This Keeps Up....
Current School Policy Making and Political Learning

Frederick M. Wirt
University of Illinois
Urbana

SP009913

Prepared for delivery at the 1976 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, September 2-5, 1976.

If This Keeps Up....
Current School Policy Making and Policy Learning

Frederick M. Wirt
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

To be asked to consider the likely futures of the current condition of political learning is humbling. Maybe Mark Twain was correct. He urged that if called upon to predict, always do so at least a century ahead; that way, no one will be around to judge you.

In this paper, the current political turbulence over schools is raised as a source of political learning for the young. After sketching the dimensions of that school politics, several main questions are raised. What can students perceive as main trends in such controversies? What political reasons (conceptualizations) can they draw from these perceptions? And what is the potential long-range effect of such political learning? These queries are directed to a little studied aspect of political socialization, the consequences of experiential learning from agents other than family, school, or peers. These are the phenomena which Jennings and Niemi refer to as "happenstance,"[1] one of the factors preventing the young from becoming carbon copies of the old.

My thesis is twofold, that the current politicization of educational issues impinges directly upon the purview of elementary and secondary children as never before, and that this impingement has great potential for reshaping perceptions and evaluations by the young of the political world. The evidence for the new politics is considerable, while that for the likely consequences for political learning is--like all speculation--at best plausible and at worst erroneous because of the resistance to politics of all age cohorts of Americans.

The Politicization of School Policy

It is first necessary to sketch the components of this newly politicized school politics, an event covered in much detail elsewhere.[2] Essentially what has taken place is that within the last decade or more a set of constituencies of the school system has challenged authority and decisions long imposed by the education profession and mutely accepted by an indifferent community. In this set, each constituency focuses upon a single, distinctive policy which it wants altered to accomodate a new distribution of resources and values. Each constituency is separated here for analytical purposes, although in reality they often overlap.

Desegregation

The first of these chronologically has been minorities, and the policy pursued has been desegregation. Fully supported by federal courts but only occasionally by Congress and by presidents (but not during the 1970's), the minorities have claimed denial of equal protection of the laws in the ongoing distribution of educational resources. While media attention to the issue would seem to make it raging in all the 16,000 school districts of the nation, it is actually focused much more narrowly, into the hundred or more large districts, which are almost all urban and heavily non-white. As a result of litigation in the South, almost all districts are desegregated and--a more telling measure--over 40 percent of the blacks attend formerly all-white schools. In the North, however, the reverse results have obtained, as more recent litigation brought great contention in some places, such as Boston, but almost none elsewhere, as in Denver. But everywhere outside the South the proportion of students in segregated schools has increased regularly.

This grossly simplified account of a complex struggle does, however display the salient elements of the new politics. That is, minority parents are a school constituency, former acquiescence in decision making has given way to use of political channels to change the educational resource distribution, the contest has involved all three levels of government and all branches at each level, and some victories have been gained by the newly energized claimants.

Finance Reform

Similar characteristics are evidenced in at least four other constituencies and their policy demands. First, taxpayers and reform of financing local schools display the same patterns, albeit this issue is much more recent. The local property tax, almost the sole source of local financing, became ever more burdensome under the inflation generated by the Vietnam War of the 1960's and by the energy crisis of the 1970's. In the late 1960's, the California Supreme Court in the Serrano decision found this tax unconstitutional in its effects, which provided unequal resources for children's schooling. There ensued a decade of effort among the states by fiscal conservatives, liberals, and homeowners to equalize tax resources or to put financing exclusively with the state or federal governments. Congress and Richard Nixon, despite toying with the thought, never increased their share of local costs, and in 1974 the U.S. Supreme Court in the Rodriguez case narrowly decided not to provide constitutional sanction to the concept. Thereupon, attacks were shifted to the state level, where while use of the referendum was unsuccessful, legislative efforts were quite effective--although only Florida voted for full state assumption of local school costs. But by 1976, this reform effort was on the wane, even though many states, as much as half, had made a sudden change in this public policy.[3]

Teacher Power

The once docile teachers whom Harmon Ziegler portrayed in the early 1960's have become tigers of school politics. Initiated in the early 1960's by statewide strikes in such nonradical places as Oklahoma and Florida, teacher organization for collective bargaining generated waves of local strikes which still continue. Once a company union for teachers, the National Education Association became increasingly militant in their interests, following the thrust of the large-city oriented American Federation of Teachers. While the objects of strikes continue to be bread and butter issues, increasingly these groups are raising questions about the organization of schools, their administration, and their curriculum.[4] They have become a vital partner in the other four new issues because they are effected by the calls for redistribution in each.

Accountability

Parents have also come in out of the closet of the typical PTA, for this constituency has increasingly challenged the quality of the services their children have received. Some form of "accountability" is called for everywhere today, and the response takes many forms: decentralization of school boards in New York City; parental advisory councils for selecting principals in Chicago; the principal and his teachers as budget-makers at the school site in California--or frustrated fundamentalists dynamiting school headquarters in Kanawha County, West Virginia. This concern unites different status levels, whether black ghetto parents complaining that their children read far below their grade levels or wealthy suburbanites' complaints against the New Math.[5]

As a result, there have been major curriculum changes underway since the "community control" fight in New York City in the mid-1960's. These changes are sometimes oriented to teaching more occupational skills--the "career

education" program of the Nixon-Ford administrations--or to returning to the fundamentals--as in the elimination of New Math in California and elsewhere--or the compensatory education program begun by Lyndon Johnson and carried on today. Where once the teacher and administrator reigned supreme within the school building, today parents are more consulted attentively and their preferences incorporated. Their incorporation is far from perfect, of course, but educators are far more open to change in even these specialist matters than once thought.[6]

Student Rights

Finally, the ultimate clientele of such politics--the students--have recently been provided a protection of basic rights which has shattered the centuries-old concept of the child as the ward of the state when in school. In the Tinker decision of 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court altered the in loco parentis role of the school authority--which meant in practice in loco Deo--to insist that the child had certain rights of expression guaranteed under the Constitution. Always cautioning that these were not absolute--expression could not be disruptive, that is--the courts have since been active in this field: expanding the student's free speech and press protections to cover a variety of modes and to proscribe a number of restrictive devises school authorities once used without thought; providing basic due process of law in requirement against suspension and expulsion without notice and hearing; and, in its continuing insistence upon school desegregation, assuring some minority students equal protection of the laws in the distribution of school resources. School administrator associations now provide schools with model regulations incorporating this constituency's new gains.[7]

Common Features of the New School Politics

In this merest of sketches of the five constituency-public policy sets involved in schools' political turbulence, certain propositions may be seen commonly involved. The first of these is that, at heart, this is but the latest skirmish in the historical fight over who controls power and resources in a democratic system. Schools have never escaped that struggle, although their professionals have succeeded for a century in casting a nonpartisan, apolitical cloud over their operations.[8] Here we see contestants urging that their private group preferences be made into public policy in a way that redistributes existing school resources, both symbolic and material. That quintessential political quality, rooted in value conflict, appears in the whole chain of the decision-making process: What resources and whose advice about them should be the significant input into the political system? How should that decisional system be structured in its rules and personnel? What should be the shape of resource distributions that are outputs from such decisional systems? Minority member, taxpayer, teacher, concerned parent, and student--each is involved in an issue which touches upon these components of the political process.

A second common feature of such school politics is the continuing effects of centralization of authority in American government. Each of these issues has been resolved (or attained its most recent development) only with resort to state or federal authorities outside the local district. In matters of desegregation, finance reform, and student rights, external courts have played the key role in authorizing the initiation of change, and in the other two issues, state legislatures have played that role. Action by Congress or the Supreme Court has made the significant difference for desegregation and student rights, and came extremely close to doing so in finance reform.

But the state has everywhere played the pivotal role, either as initiator of change or as implementer of a change thrust upon it. This is not surprising constitutionally, as the state authorizes all education policy in this nation and, far more than is realized, shapes local control by defining the agenda, actors, and resources.[9] But it is politically surprising that the state has become so vital, given its moribundity until recently. It is nothing short of remarkable that so many states have accommodated so much to these changes in such short time, although the accommodation rate has varied highly among issues and among states within an issue.[10]

A third common element of recent school politics is that one or more of these issues has agitated every school district in the nation, providing a political stimulus to the entire school system. Such systemic politics does not mean that all five issues have been contested in all 16,000 districts. Desegregation, for example, affects a relative few, as noted. But the larger and more heterogeneous the district, the more of these issues come into play, and hence the more politicized school politics becomes.[11] That is, the urban school districts more often display more of such politics.

One issue affecting most districts is financial. Even the small district is affected, because so many have their population declining, which means losing the taxpayers who finance their schools. Elsewhere, as elementary school population declines--an emergent problem across the country resulting from familiar causes--classes become smaller and buildings less used. But teachers are not laid off proportionately, and the personnel item accounts for over 80 percent of all local school budgets.

The systemic effect is seen also in teachers new power. Districts far removed from city centers are affected by this power, when rural states like

Oklahoma, or rural county seats typical of the Midwest like Mattoon, Illinois, go out on strike. And as states increasingly adopt laws authorizing negotiations with teacher representatives, the spread of this issue becomes greater and its constituents' power more institutionalized.

One evidence of the widespread agitation of local school systems is the sharply increased turnover of superintendents; for all size districts in California in 1974-75 the average tenure was 27 months. The big-city offices have been especially hard-hit; from 1970-73, 23 of the 25 largest school systems changed superintendents. As Larry Cuban points out, such dramatic turnover occurred only once before, at the end of World War I when the issue of school consolidation was controversial everywhere.[12] As noted earlier, all these issues challenged professional judgments about a public service, judgments accepted without cavil. Ironically, despite the high value given to lay control of schools, there has also been great deference to the school professional's expertise, especially the superintendent; if it hasn't been given, then this official has successfully resisted popular pressures.[13] But now, all these authority figures were under attack for not providing what some significant community segment desired.

A final sign of the system effects of these current issues is a dramatic drop in the passage of tax levies. Peaking in the mid-1960's, these indicators of system support fell off steeply thereafter. Even the usually unremarkable bond issues declined in their support; in 1960, 1 in 9 failed, but by 1975, 6 in 9 were rejected.[14] So, whether it was the educational leaders or their resource plans, parents everywhere were refusing to support them in the last decade.

The Political Learning Context of Students

One aspect of this background is crucial for its relationship to political learning. These political conflicts are being played out directly in the front of the usually apolitical students, and often involve them intimately. It is that immediacy which will concern the rest of this paper.

A brief reference to some findings from political socialization research are salient here. First, this research mostly skimps the influence of external political phenomena in the larger society, although recognizing generally that some influence probably stems from wars, depressions, and the national protests and scandals of the last decade.[15] Note however, that much of these events of recent years--Kennedy's assassination, Vietnam, civil rights, presidential elections, and Watergate and Congressional corruption--are played out on stages well removed from the students immediate purview. That is a world "out there" whose relevance isn't quite clear, and hence, quite rationally, they seem to act as if it is not made important, then attention is not worthwhile.

Certainly the classroom doesn't substantiate the importance of events "out there." As Jennings and Niemi conclude on the influence of the teachers as a socialization agency, "Traumatic events and longer term forces within the school and outside the school may shake the students, but the social studies classroom remains an unlikely source of such events and forces."[16] Nor do peers and family play the large role we once thought, leading these scholars to conclude of their 18-year-olds that "There is much in their political profiles that cannot be explained by direct appeal to the principal agents of learning."[17] Certainly they "are unlikely candidates as major sources of change in the political culture . . . ."[18]

It is the class of what I will term here extraneous illuminating events that are potential sources of new political learning in the young. They zoom in from that "other world" in a fashion to make themselves directly observable and intimately relevant to the life of the young. I term these events "extraneous" because they intervene unexpectedly in the world of primary socializing associations of the young, and "illuminating" because they throw sudden light upon political relationships formerly unknown or obscured, and hence deemed insignificant. The consequences of such effect are put concisely by Jennings and Niemi, although they note it is little studied:[19]

> Young people are especially vulnerable to the impact of external events and structural changes because their prior socialization has not been monolithic, severe, or complete. In a very real sense, their political identities, as with their psycho-social identities, are still being forged. Malleable as they are, they can be bent and transformed in a remarkably short period of time.

If such is the potential of the extraneous illuminating event, how does it relate to the new school politics traced earlier, when it is not vague events that are transpiring "out there" but a clash that rolls directly into the local school system.

Perception and Judgment by the Young of Current School Politics

If we focus only upon the present, it seems likely that many youth, in varying degrees, can perceive certain processes and make certain judgments about them. What follows assumes youth in a school system beset by at least one of those constituency-policy clusters noted earlier. It sets forth what will most likely be visible to students, and infers what at least the secondary school children can conceptualize about these events.

What Students Can Perceive

1. There is a direct challenge by ordinary citizens to the established authority of school authorities--teachers, administrators, boards. Not only is this visible locally, but in some cases--e.g., desegregation or teachers' strikes--it is also visible on the television taking place elsewhere. In short, "the powers that be" are directly attacked for proclaimed inadequacies.

2. The mode of the challenge takes two forms, one the secularly sacred rituals of the ballot and petition, but another in the form of demonstrations, abuse, and, in some cases, violence. Whatever formal civics instruction had asserted as the "proper" way to address governmental authorities can clearly be seen, e.g., pressure groups, elections, referenda, litigation, etc. But, in the protest politics of the 1960's and since, students can also see what looks to be disruptive political methods--noisy demonstrations, parades, sit-ins; an increased vilification by protesters when resisted; and violence by creatures of the night or by quite visible mobs.

3. Other levels of government than the local are drawn into the conflict. These issues find state and Washington agencies appealed to, consulted, allied with, opposed, or at least discussed by local participants. The signs of these external governments can be seen in: federal and state court mandates to perform or to stop some local school activity; in federal marshals around schools; in new state laws; in a state teacher organization's negotiator dealing with the local board; in HEW administrators and their regulations, and so on. In such fashion, the mix of governments which usually operates in local policy services became dramatically visible as their agents interacted in policy changes. Probably the most extensive sign of this is the complaint of taxpayer across the nation against the inadequate support from the state capitol for financing local

schooling, a complaint amplified in every homeowner's family as the drain of inflation increased in the early 1970's. This issue may not be as dramatic as desegregation, but it is constantly and bitterly complained about by parents--and when the crunch came, local school boards cut out favorite programs of school youth.

4. With all these pressures for change, the school institution changes or resists in varying degrees. As a result of such turbulence, the student at Hudson High School can see such changes as: blacks in formerly all-white classrooms; band and drama programs reduced severely (maybe, even football as in San Francisco for a while last year); teachers' salaries going up, with or without a strike; principals following up complaints about a bad teacher; change in regulations permitting political posters in school; and other evidences of an intruding political world "out there." Or, depending upon issue and locale, such changes are resisted successfully by defenders of the existing delivery system. The point is that whether it is occurring locally or elsewhere, students can see changes taking place to some degree, as well as continuing resistance.

What is important about these four most likely perceptions of the new school politics is that they constitute new and not redundant information about the political system. We have evidence elsewhere that non-redundant information can affect political learning in civics instruction,[20] so there is a strong presumption raised that this new politics should provide new political learning. Thus, the "establishment" can be challenged, other political means than the traditional (with their bias toward some strata of society) can be employed, the local scene is only a part of the "family of governments,"[21] and policy change does occur, even before one's eyes. I am not saying that all youth perceived all these elements--although it would be a studiedly stupid one who failed to

see at least one of them. But I am suggesting that the potential for political learning from the extraneous illuminating event has been increased by any student's perception of these events.

What Students May Conceptualize

What are they to make of all this, that is, what conceptualization of the political process could students reasonably infer from these phenomena? Several come to mind, concepts which combined may constitute a model or two.

1. School policy is politically based, politically devised, and politically administered. That is, what is perceived in this new school politics shows a clash of groups over policy preferences in whose outcome laymen have some varying influence. Moreover, the outcome of this clash is based on power. That is, the availability and use of resources superior in numbers and weight make the difference in what policy eventuates. That influence is greater than appeal to some sense of "the public interest," "majority will," or "what's good for the community."

Such effect of determinant power can be visibly seen locally when taxpayer protests at the state capitol are followed by a change in school finance laws, when a federal court desegregation order must be obeyed against an adamantly opposed community, when striking teachers overwhelm a board constrained by revenue shortfalls, when a neighborhood advisory board succeeds in removing a bad teacher, or when Hudson High's "peacenik" secures an injunction against a principal's ban on political signs on campus. The political worth of major resources versus that of proper ideals is particularly driven home when the young or their parents lose on such issues.

The significance of power in disposing of political conflict within democratic systems, long familiar to political scientists, is not a widely taught concept in pre-collegiate education. However, a highly turbulent school politics

can ram that power concept home quickly, and possibly for some time. Its application to education could be particularly bitter to those professionals who for so long have maintained a share of local resources behind the apolitical screen. In long run terms, it could mean that school policy can never again enjoy that immunity, particularly if this power concept has been learned by the young and is carried through to adulthood.

2. The participatory element of the civics model of American democracy requires more than merely voting. In the "allegiant harmonious" model drawn by Edgar Litt of what actually is taught in those civics courses--one of the few to peer into that "black box"[22]--participation was found to be restricted only to voting. But now students can see in their own local system, sometimes their own school building, that participation involves a much broader array and can be highly successful. This may not mean students will wish to engage in any more than just voting, but it does mean their conception of democratic operations has been expanded.

3. Evaluation of the worth of democracy depends upon whether you win or lose under it. The rough model of how democracy works which students have--we term it the "classical" model--relates a) an informed citizenry to b) citizen inputs to c) a reactive set of officials to d) a public policy accommodating the citizen need which originally started the process. Students can certainly see the swelling inputs and policy accommodation. But if they or their parents lose by the results, the experience can lead to normative rejection of the model as inimical to their interests, or at least it can generate some form of rationalization. Winners, however, can see their primitive model verified; it is hard to be critical of the processes which benefit us. Both, however, can see played out before their eyes the components of that sequential model of democracy which their civics instruction insisted upon. For some, "the system works," for others

it went wrong this time, and for yet others--clearly only a few--the whole system needs change. But all have a conceptual focus upon a model to which the conflict of school politics gives living--sometimes shouting--substance.

4. As a corollary to the preceding, inherent in politics are constraints upon one's choices, hence upon one's freedom. That conceptualization runs sharply contrary to the young's belief in an abstract freedom, which they most often cite in Mill's sense of the freedom to act until one impinges upon another's freedom. This school politics should make clear that that concept, no matter how often urged, does not make sense, when any decision will constrain the preferences and actions of some in order to accomodate the power of others.

Such conceptual learning, however, challenges a belief in a democratic model in which private preferences and public policy should be congruent. No matter how difficult such congruence is to analyze and find, as Robert Weissberg has recently shown in comprehensive style,[23] the classical model assumes a congruence which current school politics does not substantiate. Politics, therefore, can be seen as a restraint of total freedom for the good of some others. That it might also be for one's own good is hard to sell to a South Bostonian white, for whom freedom means freedom to do what I wish--perfectly consonant with a dominant strain of our history.

It follows, then, that compromise is not viewed as a vital ingredient of the democratic process, but as the enemy of freedom. Political scientists may praise a system where they believe "Nobody gets nothing, nobody gets everything, but everybody gets something." But such a viewpoint is hard to incorporate into a concept of the political world when one has had to surrender resources or values so that "everybody gets something." This is true both for those seeking and those defending policy change, although feeling runs higher on some of

these issues, like desegregation, than on others. Indeed, it is the variation in intensity of feelings that affects the chances of fruitful compromise in these and other public issues.

5. Winning isn't all it is cut out to be. Having observed the different stages of the policy process, students who are around long enough to seek the implementation stage, or those cohorts who succeed them, will find that winning isn't enough. Reallocation of resources and values brings in its wake new problems, as well as opportunities, and implementation requires continued strength and action.

Thus, desegregation does not simply mean bringing black and white children together in the same classroom. As observer, consultant, and writer on this issue, I am impressed by the much greater educational difficulties that take place after the buses roll and the community quiets down than by those found before this event. Detentralization to local lay boards may well mean, as it has in New York City, merely reproducing at the micro-level the conflicts of educational interests which existed before at the macro-level. As a consequence, such boards can turn into immobilized agencies because of irreconcilable interests run rampant against those without political voice: demonstrate that professionals can still recruit laymen to their side; lack sufficient resources to do anything that makes a difference in educational gains, etc.

In another issue with implementation problems, teachers may not have more power in local school policy, but more of them must spend more time at such outside work and they worry about suffering status loss for their political effort. Or, in finance reform, more money may come from the state for local schools, but the state has to get it somewhere--meaning taxpayers--by increasing other taxes. And the students who have protection of the courts in freedom of speech can be still gagged by the principal who claims a given action is disruptive.

It is not the case, to paraphrase Aaron Wildavsky on planning, "If winning is everything, maybe it is nothing." But it is the case that implementation of change is usually harder than initiating it, so the gap between output and outcome is a source of frustration and bitterness for the naive. More, given the American propensity for doing things in large scope and quickly, when scale is shrunk and time expanded in implementation (as is usually the case), the temptation to cynicism about the democratic process is enhanced. No school teaches the necessity for living with ambiguity and about the delay in political--or any other form of--life, of course. So unrealized expectations, built into most reforms, should become a major source of the young's criticism of the political process.

Research Implications

What I have shown in this speculation are hunches that (1) the immediacy of political conflict in local schools over the last decade has provided a teaching surrogate; (2) the salience of such school issues for the young has been greater than many other kinds of local and national politics; and (3) it should have had greater effect on political learning than traditional classroom instruction. Because such greater exposure has not provided equally satisfactory policy outcomes for the students--some won, some lost, some did both--I have no sense of whether all this political learning for the young has increased their cognition, affect, and long-run participation relative to the larger political system. There is a strong possibility that such politicization has been differentiated by status. That is, those already disposed to great political awareness, strong preferences, and commitment to action by reason of family status factors will be those whose political learning drawn from school politics will be enhanced, while those less favored by status will not.

This is not the place for laying out a detailed research strategy drawn from the preceding, but a suggestion is possible. The tie between the young's exposure to this school politics and subsequent satisfaction with and participation in the larger political system seems a likely point of departure. We know that greater satisfaction is evinced by adults in political institutions and policies which respond to their needs, and such satisfaction in turn enhances greater participation. Do students similarly react as a result of the political turbulence of schools?

Thus, if cohorts equally exposed are divided into those with more and less satisfaction in the input, output, and outcome stages of the policy process, then the first should show a greater desire for continued political participation, along with related attributes of continuing trust, efficacy, etc. Conversely, lesser satisfaction in these policy stages should find students less prone to participate. By "satisfaction" at any stage I mean actual or vicarious identification with what is being urged or produced by the policy system of local schools. If there is identification with more than one of these new issues, we should expect participation greatly enhanced by the aggregation of satisfaction across issues, and diluted by the lack of it. There is clear variation in these student qualities, in the number of issues they are exposed to, in the intensity of the local struggle, and in the usual status differentials of the exposed young. These are basic materials for framing a complex research strategy on the links among perception, conceptualization, satisfaction, and participation of the young who are exposed to the potential learning power of extraneous illuminating events.

But hunches are only empirical propositions yet to be tested. An intriguing quality of such research is the absence among the young of familiar referents for political learning about many of these issues. Family and peers may well

influence judgments about one, desegregation, although some intergenerational gap exists presently.[24] Indeed, it is an essential quality of these extraneous illuminating events that they are new and hence unfamiliar, thereby upsetting perceptions and evaluations because the old guides to political learning are absent. From such novel qualities of experience come new knowledge and theoretical growth elsewhere in the field of scholarship, and so may it here.

FOOTNOTES

[1]M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi, The Political Character of Adolescence (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974), 332.

[2]Frederick M. Wirt, "Political Turbulence and Administrative Authority in the Schools," in Louis Massotti and Robert Lineberry, eds., Toward a New Urban Politics (forthcoming, 1976).

[3]These events are reviewed in Donna E. Shalala and Mary Frase Williams, "Political Perspectives on Efforts to Reform School Finance," Policy Studies Journal 4 (1976), 367-75 and expanded in their chapter, similarly entitled, in Samual K. Gove and Frederick M. Wirt, eds., Political Science and School Politics (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1976), ch. 3.

[4]For an introduction to this trend, see James W. Guthrie and Patricia A. Craig, Teachers and Politics (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan Foundation, 1973) and Jack Culbertson, et. al., Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1969), ch. 7.

[5]This issue is unlike others in joining usually differing status groups in policy preferences;see Frederick M. Wirt, "Social Diversity and School Board Responsiveness in Urban Schools," in Peter J. Cistone, ed., Understanding School Boards (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1975), ch. 10.

[6]Compare evidence of administrative reactions in Dale Mann, The Politics of Administrative Representation (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1975) with Harmon Ziegler and M. Kent Jennings, Governing American Schools (N. Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1974).

[7]For a review of these legal gains, see John C. Hogan, The Schools, the Courts, and the Public Interest (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1974).

[8]For a review of this depoliticization, see: Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Vintage Books, 1964); George S. Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1927), Supplementary Educational Monographs; James M. Cronin, The Control of Urban Schools (New York: Free Press, 1973). A briefer statement of the theme is Robert H. Salisbury, "Schools and Politics in the Big City," Harvard Educational Review, 37 (1967), 408-24.

[9]Analysis of this variation in control along 36 areas of school policy for the 50 states is found in Frederick M. Wirt, "State School Policy Cultures: Power Linkages between State and Local Policy Making," in Jay Scribner, ed., Politics of Education, Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1977).

[10]Detailing of this state authority is found in Frederick M. Wirt, "Education Politics and Policies," in Herbert Jacob and Kenneth N. Vines, eds., Politics in the American States, 3rd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), ch. 8.

[11]The status basis of school politics in urban and nonurban schools is demonstrated in Wirt, "School Diversity, etc."

[12]The California data were provided by Herbert Salinger, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley. Other data are from Larry Cuban, "Urban Superintendents: Vulnerable Experts," Phi Delta Kappa 56 (1974), 279-82.

[13]This is the guiding finding of Ziegler and Jennings.

[14]Fred M. Hechinger, "Murder in Academe: The Demise of Education," Saturday Review 11 (March 20, 1976). An elaborate analysis of these results among the states is found in Frederick M. Wirt and Michael W. Kirst, Political and Social Foundations of Education (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1975), ch. 6.

[15]Jennings and Niemi, 329 ff.

[16]Ibid., 227.

[17]Ibid., 329.

[18]Ibid., 334; emphasis in original.

[19]Ibid., 332.

[20]Kenneth P. Langton and M. Kent Jennings, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States," American Political Science REview 62 (1968), 852-67. These data were extended and revised in Jennings and Niemi, ch. 7, without changing the conclusions about curriculum effect.

[21]Edith K. Mosher, "The School Board in the Family of Governments," in Cistone, ch. 5.

[22]Edgar Litt, "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination" American Sociological Review 28 (1963), 71-78.

[23]Robert Weissberg, Public Opinion and Popular Government (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976).

[24]Jennings and Niemi, ch. 3.